

DD/OIT proposal:

Conduct a test of one MSA package at an off-site location. No non-IDMS/R packages to be introduced for testing or production.

STAT Details of the proposal (per conversations with Chief, Corporate Data Program)

- Test to be conducted at TRW W-1 facility. TRW to provide all hardware and IDMS/R database. Agency to provide one MSA package and the Cullinet General Ledger package already purchased by the Agency.

- Technical evaluation to be conducted by TRW sub-contractor (ADTEC) to determine

(1) how well MSA integrates or can be integrated with IDMS/R

(2) scope of work needed to fully integrate MSA package with Cullinet package.

* - Functional evaluation to be performed by OL, to result in requirements statements for each package.

- Testing will require approximately six months

- All costs (\$700k - \$1000k) to borne by OL

* - At conclusion, OIT will make determination on whether to proceed with MSA/Cullinet mix or to proceed with all Cullinet system.

OPTIONS

PURSUE FIVE PACKAGE APPROACH

This proposal most fully exploits the package approach: it relies on the vendor having done all the work and generally avoids the time, cost, and coordination to determine interface requirements. The proposal was developed as a coordinated concept among OL, OIT, and OF LIMS team members. It is obvious that OIT and OF do not support this approach. That lack of support (active or passive) effectively eliminates this approach.

PURSUE ONE PACKAGE TEST

PURSUE THREE PACKAGE TEST

STAT The one package test does not examine the interaction of the packages, which is potentially the biggest area of gain for OL. That option is probably moot, since assures me that a three package test will be endorsed by DD/OIT if we propose it.

The three package test incorporates the inventory, purchasing, and vendor payment functions. The MSA vendor payment package has not been endorsed by OF, so there is still a political problem. If MSA passes all tests, this is a fast tract option. OIT would be obligated to construct all interfaces as needed, although at OL's cost.

WAIT

100% of the risk in testing rests with OL. 100% of the costs rests with OL. 100% of the control rests with OIT. There is no commitment by OIT beyond performing the test. They can make a decision not to accept MSA, or they can simply not decide, and we are locked out. As I stated several months ago,

if we are not going to place our reliance with the vendors's package, if we are going to shift back to development, and if we are not going to control what goes down and how it goes down, I believe it is premature to proceed. That statement is consistent with what DD/OIT has proposed, except they want to have OL underwrite their education.

SHIFT TO CULLINET

This proposal is technically sound and efficient. It is politically acceptable to OIT and OF. It could be the most economical approach, although OIT's approach seems to throw far more money at the problem than is necessary. OIT wants to go this way, but refuses to take a position because it carries the risk of irritating their customers and they don't really know if Cullinet works. (They showed no such hesitance when they selected Cullinet IDMS/R and the General Ledger package.)